

IN THE DRAWINGS

New drawings, FIGURE 5 and FIGURE 6, have been added.

In response to the Examiner's objection to the drawings, applicant submits two new drawings, FIGURE 5 and FIGURE 6. Applicant has also amended the specification accordingly. Support for FIGURE 5 may be found, for example, by reference to ¶¶ [0033], [0049], [0051]–[0053], [0062], [0075]–[0079], and [0082]–[0084]. Support for FIGURE 6 may be found, for example, by reference to ¶¶ [0033], [0049], [0051]–[0052], and [0105]–[0106]. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the drawings.

REMARKS

This communication is responsive to the Office Action mailed February 23, 2009, setting forth a Restriction Requirement, objecting to claims 2, 10, 11 and 15, and rejecting claims 1, 2, 5, 7-9, 14-18, 20 and 21.

The Examiner required restriction to one of the following inventions under 35 U.S.C. §121:

- I. Claims 20-21, drawn to a star tracking system OR an acquisition system, comprising "physical" devices, and "physical" components, classified in US class 701, subclasses 207, 222, 226.
- II. Claims 1-19, drawn to a method of assigning coefficients to measurements of stars, comprising steps: classified in class 244/164,171.

Applicant hereby elects the invention of Group II, corresponding to claims 1-19. Applicant also notes that new claim 22 is dependent from claim 2 and therefore corresponds to the claims of Group II. Support for new claim 22 may be found, for example, by reference to paragraph 100 of the Specification. Applicant reserves the right to file one or more divisional applications corresponding to the non-elected claims.

Initially, applicant notes that claims 16, 20, and 21 have been cancelled, and as a result, the Examiner's rejections of these claims are now rendered moot. Applicant has also amended claims 3, 4, 6, 12, 13, and 19 to clarify the claims.

Regarding the objections to claims 2, 11, 10 and 15, applicant has amended these claims to improve their form. In particular, claims 2 and 15 have been amended such that they no longer include the words "firstly" and "and so on". Claims 10

and 11 have been amended to more clearly identify applicant's invention. Support for the amendments to claims 10 and 11 may be found, for example, by reference to paragraph 93 of the Specification. Therefore applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's objections to the foregoing claims are now rendered moot.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 1, 2, 5, 7-9, 14, 15, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. In particular, the Examiner has rejected independent claim 1 for insufficient antecedent basis and for failing to "provide a baseline/a means for practicing this claimed invention." (Office Action, page 3). The Examiner also suggested new preamble language. Claim 1 has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, to improve form, and to address the rejection for insufficient antecedent basis. Therefore, applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection as to claim 1.

The Examiner has also rejected dependent claims 2, 5, 7-9, 14, and 17-18 for insufficient antecedent basis. Accordingly, applicant has amended claims 2, 5, and 7-9, 17 and 18 to improve form and to address the rejections for insufficient antecedent basis. Claim 14 has also been amended to improve form. Support for this amendment may be found, by reference to, for example, paragraph 100 of the Specification. Finally, as noted above, claim 15 no longer recites "and so on". As each of the Examiner's rejections has been addressed, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to the aforementioned claims.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he/she telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: June 30, 2009

Respectfully submitted,
Electronic signature: /Noelle L.
Stanley/
Noelle L. Stanley
Registration No.: 63,075
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant